

1 JEFFREY S. BUCHOLTZ  
2 Acting Assistant Attorney General  
3 CARL J. NICHOLS  
4 Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
5 JOSEPH J. HUNT  
6 Branch Director  
7 ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO  
8 Special Litigation Counsel  
9 ALEXANDER K. HAAS  
10 Trial Attorney  
11 U.S. Department of Justice  
12 Civil Division  
13 Federal Programs Branch  
14 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
15 Washington, D.C. 20001  
16 Phone: (202) 514-4782  
17 Fax: (202) 616-8470  
18 *Attorneys for the Defendants*

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

29 ) No. M:06-cv-01791-VRW  
30 IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY )  
31 TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS ) DEFENDANTS' CASE  
32 LITIGATION ) MANAGEMENT STATEMENT  
33 ) IN *Al-Haramain Islamic*  
34 This Document Solely Relates To: ) *Foundation et al. v. Bush et al.*  
35 )  
36 *Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation et al. v Bush,* ) Date: February 7, 2008  
37 et al. (07-109) ) Time: 10:00 a.m.  
38 ) Courtroom: 19  
39 ) Honorable Vaughn R. Walker  
40 )  
41 )

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

**INTRODUCTION**

101 On January 25, 2008, the Court issued an order setting a Case Management Conference  
102 in this action for February 7, 2008. Under Local Rule 16-10(d), parties are required to submit  
103 joint case management statements within ten (10) days of the conference. Because the Court's  
104 order setting the conference was itself issued ten business days before the conference, timely  
105 compliance was not possible, but the parties nonetheless conferred by phone to discuss our  
106 respective positions in order to prepare for the conference.

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145

1146

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1260

1261

1262

1263

1264

1265

1266

1267

1268

1269

1270

1271

1272

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

1294

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

1312

1313

1314

1315

1316

1317

1318

1319

1320

1321

1322

1 On February 4, 2008, however, without any prior notice to Defendants, the Plaintiffs filed  
2 a separate “Supplemental Case Management Statement” (hereafter “Pls. CMC Stmt.”) setting  
3 forth their positions on various issues that may arise at the conference. While the parties had  
4 discussed some of the issues raised in this statement, Plaintiffs did not advise the Defendants that  
5 they intended to file their own statement, nor permit Defendants to set forth their position on the  
6 various issues raised in that document. In addition, Plaintiffs did not confer with the Defendants  
7 as to the specific briefing and hearing schedule they proposed to the Court.<sup>1/</sup>

8 Under these circumstances, Defendants submit their own separate statement to advise the  
9 Court of their position on the various issues raised by Plaintiffs.

10 **DEFENDANTS SUPPLEMENTAL CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

11 1. *Procedural History*

12 This action is on remand from the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, which upheld  
13 the United States’ assertion of the state secrets privilege to bar disclosure of whether or not the  
14 Plaintiffs were subject to alleged surveillance by the Government. *See Al-Haramain Islamic*  
15 *Foundation v. Bush*, 507 F.3d 1190 (9th Cir. 2007). The Court of Appeals remanded the matter  
16 for consideration of whether the state secrets privilege is preempted by provisions of the Foreign  
17 Intelligence Surveillance Act (“FISA”), 50 U.S.C. §§ 1801-1871. *See id.* at 1205.

18 As the Court is aware, the Plaintiffs in this action are the Al-Haramain Islamic  
19 Foundation of Oregon (“AHIF”), an entity designated by the United States and the United  
20 Nations as a terrorist organization with ties to al Qaeda, and two attorneys who are affiliated

21

---

22 <sup>1</sup> With respect to initial case management conferences, Local Rule 16-9(a) provides that  
23 a party may file a separate case management statement only where it has been “unable, despite  
24 reasonable efforts, to obtain the cooperation of another party in the preparation of a joint  
25 statement,” and even in that circumstance a declaration must be submitted describing the conduct  
26 of the uncooperative party that prevented the preparation of a joint statement. *See L.R. 16-9(a).*  
Plaintiffs would have no grounds to contend that their subsequent case management statement  
was the result of any lack of cooperation since they never advised Defendants that they intended  
to file a separate statement nor sought their cooperation in a joint statement.

1 with Al-Haramain. Plaintiffs allege that, in March and April 2004, they were subjected to  
2 warrantless foreign intelligence surveillance authorized by the President after the September 11,  
3 2001 attacks, and seek to pursue various causes of action related to that alleged surveillance.  
4 *See Complaint (Dkt. 07-109, Dkt. # 1, Part # 1).*

5 On June 21, 2006, the Director of National Intelligence (“DNI”) asserted the state secrets  
6 privilege in this case, and the Defendants moved to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary  
7 judgment, on the grounds that evidence protected by the state secrets privilege is necessary to  
8 litigate this case, including in particular whether or not the Plaintiffs had been subject to alleged  
9 warrantless surveillance and thus had standing. The DNI also asserted privilege as to  
10 information contained in a classified document that had been inadvertently disclosed to Plaintiffs  
11 during Treasury Department proceedings on the designation of AHIF.

12 In a September 2006 ruling, the District Court for the District of Oregon (Judge King)  
13 recognized that the Government had properly invoked the state secrets privilege, but nonetheless  
14 declined to dismiss the case. *See Al-Haramain v. Bush*, 451 F. Supp. 2d 1215 (D. Or. 2006).  
15 Judge King certified that decision for interlocutory review pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b).

16 By Order dated December 15, 2006, this case was transferred to this Court by the Judicial  
17 Panel on Multi-district Litigation. *See Dkt. #97, MDL-1791.*

18 By Order dated December 21, 2006, the Court of Appeals granted Defendants’ petition  
19 for interlocutory review of the district court’s denial of Defendants’ motion to dismiss.

20 On January 17, 2007, Defendants filed a notice with this Court indicating that any  
21 surveillance that had been occurring under the Terrorist Surveillance Program was now  
22 occurring subject to orders of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and that the TSP had  
23 lapsed. *See Dkt. #127, MDL-1791.*

24 On March 13, 2007, this Court ordered that briefing proceed on Plaintiffs’ motion for  
25 summary judgment in this case. *See Dkt. # 196, MDL-1791.*

26 By Order dated April 4, 2007, the Court of Appeals stayed all proceedings in this Court  
27 pending resolution of Defendants’ appeal. *See Dkt. # 227, MDL-1791.*

28 **Defendants’ Case Management Statement**  
*Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation et al. v. Bush et al. (07-109)*  
**MDL No. 06-1791-VRW**

1 On November 16, 2007, the Ninth Circuit reversed the denial of the Government’s  
2 motion to dismiss and upheld the Government’s state secrets privilege assertion to protect and  
3 exclude from this case information as to whether or not the Plaintiffs had been subject to the  
4 alleged surveillance. *See Al-Haramain*, 507 F.3d at 1202-04. In particular, the Court upheld the  
5 Government’s privilege assertion as to the sealed document that had been inadvertently disclosed  
6 to the Plaintiffs, and excluded that document from the case. *See id.* at 1204. The Ninth Circuit  
7 then went on to hold that, without the privileged information, Plaintiffs could not establish their  
8 standing to litigate their claims. *See id.* at 1205. In upholding the government’s assertion of the  
9 state secrets privilege, the Ninth Circuit stated, after conducting “a very careful” review of the  
10 classified record, that the basis for the privilege was “exceptionally well documented” in  
11 “[d]etailed statements.” *Id.* at 1203; *see also id.* (“We take very seriously our obligation to  
12 review the documents with a very careful, indeed a skeptical eye, and not to accept at face value  
13 the government’s claim or justification of privilege. Simply saying ‘military secret,’ ‘national  
14 security,’ or ‘terrorist threat’ or invoking an ethereal fear that disclosure will threaten our nation  
15 is insufficient to support the privilege. Sufficient detail must be—and *has been*—provided for  
16 us to make a meaningful examination.”) (emphasis added).

17 The Court of Appeals declined to decide a separate issue raised on appeal—whether the  
18 FISA preempts the state secrets privilege—and remanded for the district court to consider that  
19 issue and any proceedings collateral to that determination. *See id.* at 1206.

20 2. *Remand Proceedings*

21 The principal issue raised by Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Case Management Statement is  
22 whether the Court should consider Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment in conjunction with  
23 remand proceedings concerning whether FISA Section 1806(f) preempts the state secrets  
24 privilege. *See* Pls. CMC Stm. at 2-3. Defendants disagree with Plaintiffs’ proposed approach.  
25 We submit that, before the parties brief the merits of Plaintiffs’ claims, the Court should first  
26 consider several threshold jurisdictional and preemption issues, including the issue identified by  
27 the Ninth Circuit in its remand, that go to whether the merits could even be reached.

28 **Defendants’ Case Management Statement**

*Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation et al. v. Bush et al. (07-109)*  
MDL No. 06-1791-VRW

1 There are several reasons to proceed in this manner. First, the landscape of this case has  
2 changed significantly since Plaintiffs filed their motion for summary judgment. Among other  
3 things, the challenged surveillance activity—the Terrorist Surveillance Program—is no longer  
4 operative; the Court of Appeals has upheld the state secrets privilege as to the very document on  
5 which Plaintiffs previously built their summary judgment motion; the Court of Appeals further  
6 held that Plaintiffs could not prove their standing to proceed without the disclosure of  
7 information that would harm national security. In light of these holdings, we respectfully submit  
8 that the Court should proceed carefully and address first various threshold questions as to  
9 whether and how this case may proceed, including the specific issue remanded by the Court of  
10 Appeals, before simultaneously entertaining briefing on the merits through Plaintiffs' summary  
11 judgment motion.

12 One threshold issue is whether there any specific claims left in this case to adjudicate.  
13 The lapse of the TSP in January 2007 forecloses any prospective relief in this case, leaving only  
14 Plaintiffs' claim for damages under FISA Section 1810. *See* 50 U.S.C. §1810. But FISA  
15 Section 1810 is not a waiver of sovereign immunity for a claim of damages against the United  
16 States, as Plaintiffs seek. *See* Compl. ¶ 27. These issues should be adjudicated before  
17 attempting to brief Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment.

18 In addition, the question of whether Plaintiffs can prove their standing without harm to  
19 national security will remain at issue on remand and should be decided before reaching the  
20 merits. Whether or not Plaintiffs are “aggrieved parties” under the FISA is critical to whether  
21 they can proceed at all under Section 1806(f), assuming that provision should be applied here,  
22 and whether this issue can be addressed in light of the Ninth Circuit's ruling should also be  
23 resolved before proceeding to the merits.

24 Beyond this, the central question on which the Court of Appeals believed that a remand is  
25 appropriate—whether the FISA preempts the state secrets privilege (and, we would add, whether  
26 Section 1806(f) is even applicable here)—presents threshold issues that will impact whether the  
27 case can proceed. Simply put, the Court should decide *whether* certain statutory provisions (like

28 **Defendants' Case Management Statement**

*Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation et al. v. Bush et al. (07-109)*  
MDL No. 06-1791-VRW

1 Section 1806(f)) apply in this case before attempting to actually apply them in an adjudication of  
2 the merits. The Court should take matters in this logical order, especially in light of the harms to  
3 national security at stake in this case (which have been recognized by the Court of Appeals). If  
4 the Court finds the case cannot proceed in light of the state secrets privilege upheld by the Court  
5 of Appeals, or if it finds that Section 1806(f) does not apply here, the case would be over.<sup>2/</sup> To  
6 simultaneously brief myriad constitutional theories<sup>3/</sup> at the very same time the Court is assessing  
7 whether and how the merits may proceed makes little sense in Defendants' view.

8 Moreover, even if Section 1806(f) of the FISA could be applied here, those proceedings  
9 would be far different than anything contemplated by normal summary judgment proceedings.

10 See 50 U.S.C. § 1806(f) (authorizing *in camera, ex parte* submissions to determine the legality of  
11 surveillance); *see also Al-Haramain*, 507 F.3d at 1204 (Section 1806(f) proceedings entail  
12 "detailed procedural safeguards that must be satisfied *before* such review can be conducted").

13 Such proceedings under Section 1806(f) are specifically designed to be special procedures  
14 undertaken outside the normal litigation process. It is this process that would be the  
15 "proceedings collateral" to any determination that Section 1806(f) preempts the state secrets  
16 privilege, *see id.* at 1205,— not proceeding now on Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment.  
17 Indeed, the Court of Appeals decision on the state secrets privilege should foreclose the kind of  
18 summary judgment proceedings Plaintiffs apparently still contemplate in which they may rely on

19 <sup>2/</sup> Indeed, Plaintiffs concede that proceedings on their motion may commence only "if  
20 this Court finds that FISA preempts the state secrets privilege *and permits* the litigation to go  
forward." *See* Pls. CMC Stmt. at 2 (emphasis added).

21 <sup>3/</sup> Plaintiffs challenge alleged surveillance of them on numerous grounds, including as a  
22 violation of the FISA, the separation of powers doctrine, Fourth Amendment, First Amendment,  
23 and International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—all of which were raised by Plaintiffs'  
24 prior motion for summary judgment and, if raised again, would be at issue before the Court  
25 decides whether the case can proceed at all. *See* Memorandum in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion  
26 for Partial Summary Judgment of Liability or, Alternatively, Partial Summary Adjudication of  
27 Specific Issues within Claims (Dkt. #85, Civ. 06-274-KI (D. Or.)). Plaintiffs also argued in their  
prior motion that the lawfulness of the now inoperative Terrorist Surveillance Program could be  
decided on "summary adjudication" *without* a prior determination as to their standing, *see id.* at  
32-33,—which obviously is meritless.

1 the inadvertently disclosed sealed document that is now excluded from this case, or their  
2 memory of it. *See id.* at 1204.

3 The sole reason Plaintiffs advance for proceeding now to their summary judgment  
4 motion is that doing so would somehow avoid “literally years of delay that would otherwise  
5 result from consecutive decisions on the various issues and the multiple attendant interlocutory  
6 appeals that would likely be sought from each decision.” *See* Pls. CMC Stmt. at 3. Plaintiffs’  
7 assertion does not hold up. Assuming the case is not dismissed (as we believe it should be),  
8 whether an interlocutory appeal is necessary, permitted by law, or appropriate is a matter that  
9 could (and would) be addressed separately at the appropriate time by the parties and Court.  
10 Briefing the kind of threshold questions Defendants have outlined would not lock the case into  
11 inevitable years of delay; indeed, it may dispose of the case immediately. Conversely,  
12 attempting to brief a range of constitutional theories before the Court has decided whether and  
13 how the case should proceed would not prevent questions that may require further review from  
14 arising—such as whether the FISA preempts the state secrets privilege—nor the parties or Court  
15 from seeking further review.

16 For these reasons, Defendants propose that their own motion to dismiss, raising the issues  
17 described herein, including the question remanded by the Court of Appeals, should logically be  
18 considered first, especially give the underlying national security concerns already found by the  
19 Court of Appeals.

20 3. “Amicus” Briefs from Other MDL Parties

21 Plaintiffs propose that amicus briefs be filed by parties in other cases in the MDL  
22 proceedings, including in the *Hepting* action that is presently still on appeal. Plaintiffs do not  
23 specify what issues will be addressed by these “amicus,” but presumably these briefs would be  
24 limited to the Section 1806(f) issue described above. Defendants defer to the Court’s wishes as  
25 to whether it wants to receive additional briefs from non-parties in this case on this issue. We  
26 would simply observe that this may not be necessary or appropriate at this stage in *Al-Haramain*  
27 or in light of the *Hepting* appeal.

28 Defendants’ Case Management Statement

*Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation et al. v. Bush et al. (07-109)*  
MDL No. 06-1791-VRW

As outlined above, this case presents unique issues and circumstances that may foreclose reaching the Section 1806(f) issue. We also note that the parties in other MDL cases are not actually “amicus” offering an opinion about whether Section 1806(f) should be applied in *Al-Haramain*—a matter about which they would have little or no foundation on which to opine. Rather, the other MDL litigants are *parties* to cases presently in this Court and likely would set forth their views concerning how Section 1806(f) should apply in their case. Some of those parties (in the *Verizon* and *Shubert* cases) have already done so in response to the Government’s motions to dismiss or for summary judgment, which were heard in August 2007 and are under submission to the Court. In addition, the *Hepting* appeal is still pending, and among the issues that have been raised on appeal is whether Section 1806(f) should be applied in that challenge to the alleged actions of telecommunication carriers. Thus, if the Court wishes to consider the Section 1806(f) the issue at one time, the appropriate course for all cases may be to wait for resolution of the *Hepting* appeal. Otherwise, Defendants are ready to proceed now in *Al-Haramain* and believe the briefs of the parties in that case will address all the pertinent issues fully, but leave for the Court to decide whether other MDL parties should participate in the briefing as well.

4. *Schedule for Proceeding*

Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Case Management Statement includes a proposed schedule as to which they did not confer with Defendants, even as to Government counsel’s availability on the proposed hearing date.<sup>4</sup> The Court had previously advised the parties “to make best efforts to resolve scheduling and other procedural issues by conferring with opposing counsel in the case(s) before contacting the court.” *See* Order dated 9/10/07 (Dkt. 370, MDL-1791).

Defendants request that the Court not enter the Plaintiffs’ proposed schedule until the parties have had an opportunity to fully confer on the matter. Defendants will seek to do so in advance

---

<sup>4</sup> We understand that Plaintiffs’ counsel did confer with counsel for the *Hepting* plaintiffs in developing their proposed schedule.

28 **Defendants’ Case Management Statement**

*Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation et al. v. Bush et al. (07-109)*  
MDL No. 06-1791-VRW

1 of the case management conference.<sup>5/</sup>

2 *Page Limits*

3 Defendants do not oppose Plaintiffs' request to file a 45-page brief so long as the page  
4 limits are reciprocal.

5 February 6, 2008

6 Respectfully Submitted,

7 JEFFREY S. BUCHOLTZ  
8 Acting Assistant Attorney General

9 CARL J. NICHOLS  
10 Deputy Assistant Attorney General

11 JOSEPH J. HUNT  
12 Branch Director

13 s/ Anthony J. Coppolino  
14 ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO  
15 Special Litigation Counsel  
16 tony.coppolino@usdoj.gov

17 s/ Alexander K. Haas  
18 ALEXANDER K. HAAS  
19 Trial Attorney  
20 U.S. Department of Justice  
21 Civil Division  
22 Federal Programs Branch  
23 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
24 Washington, D.C. 20001  
25 Phone: (202) 514-4782  
26 Fax: (202) 616-8470  
27 Attorneys for the Defendants

28 <sup>5</sup> Defendants note that Plaintiffs' proposed schedule fails to account for the fact that the  
29 Defendants would also be filing a dispositive motion and does not schedule all of the  
30 submissions associated with such a motion, including the Defendants reply brief. Also,  
31 assuming amicus briefs are filed, Plaintiffs would grant Defendants just seven (7) days to reply  
32 to an unknown number of such briefs. Finally, the proposed schedule would allow the Court less  
33 than two weeks to review all of these submissions before a hearing.